

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for total consideration given the present application. Claims 1-14 were pending prior to the Office Action. Claim 15 has been added through this Reply. Thus, claims 1-15 are currently pending of which claims 1, 4, 8, 14, and 15 are independent. Claim 14 has been amended through this Reply. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claim in light of the amendment and remarks presented herein, and earnestly seek timely allowance of all pending claims.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants appreciate that claims 1-13 are allowed.

35 U.S.C. § 102 REJECTION – Inoue

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Inoue et al. (U.S. 6,185,360)[hereinafter "Inoue"]. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

For a Section 102 rejection to be proper, the cited reference must teach or suggest each and every claimed element. *See M.P.E.P. 2131; M.P.E.P. 706.02*. Thus, if the cited reference fails to teach or suggest one or more elements, then the rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

In this instance, Inoue fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed element. For example, amended independent claim 14 recites, *inter alia*, "providing a processing device for detecting the connection of a power source plug to an external power source; detecting whether the initial settings are programmed into the electronic receiver, which is activated by said processing device." *Emphasis added*. Note that the above-identified claim feature has been incorporated as a method step from allowed claim 8. As acknowledged by the Examiner, Inoue fails to teach or suggest the above-identified claim feature.

As previously submitted, Inoue merely discloses an information receiving apparatus and method for automatically recording reserved programs when the recording time of the reserved programs overlap. According to the method of Inoue, the system determines or judges which of the overlapping programs is to be recorded based on additional program information. Particularly, Inoue discloses a controller 23h, which detects this overlapping of recording time of

Particularly, Inoue discloses a controller 23h, which detects this overlapping of recording time of programs and a comparing and determining means 23g, which determines which of the overlapping programs is to be recorded. Nowhere in Inoue is there any disclosure or suggestion of a step of providing a processing device for detecting the connection of a power source plug to an external power source; detecting whether the initial settings are programmed into the electronic receiver, which is activated by said processing device as recited in claim 14.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, independent claim 14 is distinguishable from Inoue.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 14, based on Inoue, be withdrawn.

New Claim

New method claim 15 corresponds to allowed claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 15 is allowable over Inoue.

Conclusion


In view of the above remarks, it is believed that all pending claims are allowable.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Ali M. Imam Reg. No. 58,755 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: January 9, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By  #58,755
Michael K. Mutter
Registration No.: 29,680
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant